

1 Robert B. Gerard, Esq. (Nevada State Bar #005323)
2 Ricardo R. Ehmann, Esq. (Nevada State Bar #010576)
3 **GERARD & ASSOCIATES**
4 2840 South Jones Boulevard
5 Building D, Suite #4
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
7 Telephone: (702) 251-0093
8 Facsimile: (702) 251-0094

9 Norman Blumenthal, Esq. (California State Bar #068687)
10 **BLUMENTHAL, NORDREHAUG & BHOWMIK**
11 2255 Calle Clara
12 La Jolla, California 92037
13 Telephone: (858) 551-1223
14 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

18 MARY ANN SUSSEX, et al.) CASE NO.: **2:08-cv-00773-MMD-PAL**
19)
20 Plaintiffs,) **PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN**
21) **OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO**
22) **DISQUALIFY ARBITRATOR**
23)
24 TURNBERRY/MGM GRAND)
25 TOWERS, LLC, et al.) Before: Hon. Miranda Du
26) Department: 4A
27)
28 Defendants.)
29)
30)
31)
32)
33)
34)
35)
36)
37)
38)
39)
40)
41)
42)
43)
44)
45)
46)
47)
48)
49)
50)
51)
52)
53)
54)
55)
56)
57)
58)
59)
60)
61)
62)
63)
64)
65)
66)
67)
68)
69)
70)
71)
72)
73)
74)
75)
76)
77)
78)
79)
80)
81)
82)
83)
84)
85)
86)
87)
88)
89)
90)
91)
92)
93)
94)
95)
96)
97)
98)
99)
100)
101)
102)
103)
104)
105)
106)
107)
108)
109)
110)
111)
112)
113)
114)
115)
116)
117)
118)
119)
120)
121)
122)
123)
124)
125)
126)
127)
128)
129)
130)
131)
132)
133)
134)
135)
136)
137)
138)
139)
140)
141)
142)
143)
144)
145)
146)
147)
148)
149)
150)
151)
152)
153)
154)
155)
156)
157)
158)
159)
160)
161)
162)
163)
164)
165)
166)
167)
168)
169)
170)
171)
172)
173)
174)
175)
176)
177)
178)
179)
180)
181)
182)
183)
184)
185)
186)
187)
188)
189)
190)
191)
192)
193)
194)
195)
196)
197)
198)
199)
200)
201)
202)
203)
204)
205)
206)
207)
208)
209)
210)
211)
212)
213)
214)
215)
216)
217)
218)
219)
220)
221)
222)
223)
224)
225)
226)
227)
228)
229)
230)
231)
232)
233)
234)
235)
236)
237)
238)
239)
240)
241)
242)
243)
244)
245)
246)
247)
248)
249)
250)
251)
252)
253)
254)
255)
256)
257)
258)
259)
260)
261)
262)
263)
264)
265)
266)
267)
268)
269)
270)
271)
272)
273)
274)
275)
276)
277)
278)
279)
280)
281)
282)
283)
284)
285)
286)
287)
288)
289)
290)
291)
292)
293)
294)
295)
296)
297)
298)
299)
300)
301)
302)
303)
304)
305)
306)
307)
308)
309)
310)
311)
312)
313)
314)
315)
316)
317)
318)
319)
320)
321)
322)
323)
324)
325)
326)
327)
328)
329)
330)
331)
332)
333)
334)
335)
336)
337)
338)
339)
340)
341)
342)
343)
344)
345)
346)
347)
348)
349)
350)
351)
352)
353)
354)
355)
356)
357)
358)
359)
360)
361)
362)
363)
364)
365)
366)
367)
368)
369)
370)
371)
372)
373)
374)
375)
376)
377)
378)
379)
380)
381)
382)
383)
384)
385)
386)
387)
388)
389)
390)
391)
392)
393)
394)
395)
396)
397)
398)
399)
400)
401)
402)
403)
404)
405)
406)
407)
408)
409)
410)
411)
412)
413)
414)
415)
416)
417)
418)
419)
420)
421)
422)
423)
424)
425)
426)
427)
428)
429)
430)
431)
432)
433)
434)
435)
436)
437)
438)
439)
440)
441)
442)
443)
444)
445)
446)
447)
448)
449)
450)
451)
452)
453)
454)
455)
456)
457)
458)
459)
460)
461)
462)
463)
464)
465)
466)
467)
468)
469)
470)
471)
472)
473)
474)
475)
476)
477)
478)
479)
480)
481)
482)
483)
484)
485)
486)
487)
488)
489)
490)
491)
492)
493)
494)
495)
496)
497)
498)
499)
500)
501)
502)
503)
504)
505)
506)
507)
508)
509)
510)
511)
512)
513)
514)
515)
516)
517)
518)
519)
520)
521)
522)
523)
524)
525)
526)
527)
528)
529)
530)
531)
532)
533)
534)
535)
536)
537)
538)
539)
540)
541)
542)
543)
544)
545)
546)
547)
548)
549)
550)
551)
552)
553)
554)
555)
556)
557)
558)
559)
560)
561)
562)
563)
564)
565)
566)
567)
568)
569)
570)
571)
572)
573)
574)
575)
576)
577)
578)
579)
580)
581)
582)
583)
584)
585)
586)
587)
588)
589)
590)
591)
592)
593)
594)
595)
596)
597)
598)
599)
600)
601)
602)
603)
604)
605)
606)
607)
608)
609)
610)
611)
612)
613)
614)
615)
616)
617)
618)
619)
620)
621)
622)
623)
624)
625)
626)
627)
628)
629)
630)
631)
632)
633)
634)
635)
636)
637)
638)
639)
640)
641)
642)
643)
644)
645)
646)
647)
648)
649)
650)
651)
652)
653)
654)
655)
656)
657)
658)
659)
660)
661)
662)
663)
664)
665)
666)
667)
668)
669)
670)
671)
672)
673)
674)
675)
676)
677)
678)
679)
680)
681)
682)
683)
684)
685)
686)
687)
688)
689)
690)
691)
692)
693)
694)
695)
696)
697)
698)
699)
700)
701)
702)
703)
704)
705)
706)
707)
708)
709)
710)
711)
712)
713)
714)
715)
716)
717)
718)
719)
720)
721)
722)
723)
724)
725)
726)
727)
728)
729)
730)
731)
732)
733)
734)
735)
736)
737)
738)
739)
740)
741)
742)
743)
744)
745)
746)
747)
748)
749)
750)
751)
752)
753)
754)
755)
756)
757)
758)
759)
760)
761)
762)
763)
764)
765)
766)
767)
768)
769)
770)
771)
772)
773)
774)
775)
776)
777)
778)
779)
780)
781)
782)
783)
784)
785)
786)
787)
788)
789)
790)
791)
792)
793)
794)
795)
796)
797)
798)
799)
800)
801)
802)
803)
804)
805)
806)
807)
808)
809)
810)
811)
812)
813)
814)
815)
816)
817)
818)
819)
820)
821)
822)
823)
824)
825)
826)
827)
828)
829)
830)
831)
832)
833)
834)
835)
836)
837)
838)
839)
840)
841)
842)
843)
844)
845)
846)
847)
848)
849)
850)
851)
852)
853)
854)
855)
856)
857)
858)
859)
860)
861)
862)
863)
864)
865)
866)
867)
868)
869)
870)
871)
872)
873)
874)
875)
876)
877)
878)
879)
880)
881)
882)
883)
884)
885)
886)
887)
888)
889)
890)
891)
892)
893)
894)
895)
896)
897)
898)
899)
900)
901)
902)
903)
904)
905)
906)
907)
908)
909)
910)
911)
912)
913)
914)
915)
916)
917)
918)
919)
920)
921)
922)
923)
924)
925)
926)
927)
928)
929)
930)
931)
932)
933)
934)
935)
936)
937)
938)
939)
940)
941)
942)
943)
944)
945)
946)
947)
948)
949)
950)
951)
952)
953)
954)
955)
956)
957)
958)
959)
960)
961)
962)
963)
964)
965)
966)
967)
968)
969)
970)
971)
972)
973)
974)
975)
976)
977)
978)
979)
980)
981)
982)
983)
984)
985)
986)
987)
988)
989)
990)
991)
992)
993)
994)
995)
996)
997)
998)
999)
1000)
1001)
1002)
1003)
1004)
1005)
1006)
1007)
1008)
1009)
1010)
1011)
1012)
1013)
1014)
1015)
1016)
1017)
1018)
1019)
1020)
1021)
1022)
1023)
1024)
1025)
1026)
1027)
1028)
1029)
1030)
1031)
1032)
1033)
1034)
1035)
1036)
1037)
1038)
1039)
1040)
1041)
1042)
1043)
1044)
1045)
1046)
1047)
1048)
1049)
1050)
1051)
1052)
1053)
1054)
1055)
1056)
1057)
1058)
1059)
1060)
1061)
1062)
1063)
1064)
1065)
1066)
1067)
1068)
1069)
1070)
1071)
1072)
1073)
1074)
1075)
1076)
1077)
1078)
1079)
1080)
1081)
1082)
1083)
1084)
1085)
1086)
1087)
1088)
1089)
1090)
1091)
1092)
1093)
1094)
1095)
1096)
1097)
1098)
1099)
1100)
1101)
1102)
1103)
1104)
1105)
1106)
1107)
1108)
1109)
1110)
1111)
1112)
1113)
1114)
1115)
1116)
1117)
1118)
1119)
1120)
1121)
1122)
1123)
1124)
1125)
1126)
1127)
1128)
1129)
1130)
1131)
1132)
1133)
1134)
1135)
1136)
1137)
1138)
1139)
1140)
1141)
1142)
1143)
1144)
1145)
1146)
1147)
1148)
1149)
1150)
1151)
1152)
1153)
1154)
1155)
1156)
1157)
1158)
1159)
1160)
1161)
1162)
1163)
1164)
1165)
1166)
1167)
1168)
1169)
1170)
1171)
1172)
1173)
1174)
1175)
1176)
1177)
1178)
1179)
1180)
1181)
1182)
1183)
1184)
1185)
1186)
1187)
1188)
1189)
1190)
1191)
1192)
1193)
1194)
1195)
1196)
1197)
1198)
1199)
1200)
1201)
1202)
1203)
1204)
1205)
1206)
1207)
1208)
1209)
1210)
1211)
1212)
1213)
1214)
1215)
1216)
1217)
1218)
1219)
1220)
1221)
1222)
1223)
1224)
1225)
1226)
1227)
1228)
1229)
1230)
1231)
1232)
1233)
1234)
1235)
1236)
1237)
1238)
1239)
1240)
1241)
1242)
1243)
1244)
1245)
1246)
1247)
1248)
1249)
1250)
1251)
1252)
1253)
1254)
1255)
1256)
1257)
1258)
1259)
1260)
1261)
1262)
1263)
1264)
1265)
1266)
1267)
1268)
1269)
1270)
1271)
1272)
1273)
1274)
1275)
1276)
1277)
1278)
1279)
1280)
1281)
1282)
1283)
1284)
1285)
1286)
1287)
1288)
1289)
1290)
1291)
1292)
1293)
1294)
1295)
1296)
1297)
1298)
1299)
1300)
1301)
1302)
1303)
1304)
1305)
1306)
1307)
1308)
1309)
1310)
1311)
1312)
1313)
1314)
1315)
1316)
1317)
1318)
1319)
1320)
1321)
1322)
1323)
1324)
1325)
1326)
1327)
1328)
1329)
1330)
1331)
1332)
1333)
1334)
1335)
1336)
1337)
1338)
1339)
1340)
1341)
1342)
1343)
1344)
1345)
1346)
1347)
1348)
1349)
1350)
1351)
1352)
1353)
1354)
1355)
1356)
1357)
1358)
1359)
1360)
1361)
1362)
1363)
1364)
1365)
1366)
1367)
1368)
1369)
1370)
1371)
1372)
1373)
1374)
1375)
1376)
1377)
1378)
1379)
1380)
1381)
1382)
1383)
1384)
1385)
1386)
1387)
1388)
1389)
1390)
1391)
1392)
1393)
1394)
1395)
1396)
1397)
1398)
1399)
1400)
1401)
1402)
1403)
1404)
1405)
1406)
1407)
1408)
1409)
1410)
1411)
1412)
1413)
1414)
1415)
1416)
1417)
1418)
1419)
1420)
1421)
1422)
1423)
1424)
1425)
1426)
1427)
1428)
1429)
1430)
1431)
1432)
1433)
1434)
1435)
1436)
1437)
1438)
1439)
1440)
1441)
1442)
1443)
1444)
1445)
1446)
1447)
1448)
1449)
1450)
1451)
1452)
1453)
1454)
1455)
1456)
1457)
1458)
1459)
1460)
1461)
1462)
1463)
1464)
1465)
1466)
1467)
1468)
1469)
1470)
1471)
1472)
1473)
1474)
1475)
1476)
1477)
1478)
1479)
1480)
1481)
1482)
1483)
1484)
1485)
1486)
1487)
1488)
1489)
1490)
1491)
1492)
1493)
1494)
1495)
1496)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	The Motion is Procedurally Defective	1
B.	The Motion is Legally Infirm	2
C.	The Motion Is Substantively Without Merit	3
II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	5
A.	Arbitrator Hare Has No Financial Interest in or Relationship With Any Party or Their Counsel or the Claims in this Arbitration	6
B.	Arbitrator Hare's Experience and Practice In Representing Plaintiffs, Consumers and Mortgagors Was Fully Disclosed	7
C.	Information Concerning Bowdoin Street Capital Could Not Create a Reasonable Impression of Partiality	8
III.	THE MOTION IS PROCEDURALLY DEFECTIVE	10
IV.	THE MOTION IS LEGALLY INFIRM	15
V.	THE MOTION IS SUBSTANTIVELY WITHOUT MERIT	19
VI.	CONCLUSION	29

1

2 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

3

Cases:

		Page(s):
4	<i>Aerojet-General Corp. v. American Arbitration Assoc.,</i> 478 F.2d 248 (9 th Cir. 1973)	1, 12, 13, 18
5	<i>ANR Coal Co., Inc. v. Cogentrix of North Carolina, Inc.,</i> 173 F.3d 493 (4th Cir.1999)	4, 10, 20, 24
7	<i>Application of York Hannover Holding A.G. v. American Arbitration Ass'n.,</i> 1993 WL 159961 (S.D.N.Y. May 11, 1993)	14
9	<i>Aviall, Inc. v. Ryder Sys., Inc.,</i> 110 F.3d 892 (2d Cir.1997)	10
10	<i>Barnes v. Logan,</i> 122 F.3d 820 (9th Cir.1997)	17
12	<i>Benjamin, Weill & Mazer v. Kors,</i> 195 Cal.App.4th 40 (2011)	26, 27
13	<i>Blue Cross Blue Shield of Tennessee v. BCS Ins. Co.,</i> 517 F.Supp.2d 1050 (N.D. Ill 2007)	10, 12
15	<i>Brandon, Jones, Sandall, Zeide, Kohn, Chalal & Musso, P.A. v. MedPartners, Inc.,</i> 203 F.R.D. 677 (S.D. Fla. 2001), aff'd 312 F.3d 1349 (11th Cir. 2002)	10
16	<i>Burlington Ins. Co. v. Trygg-Hansa Ins. Co., AB,</i> 2002 WL 855911 (M.D.N.C. April 19, 2002)	15
18	<i>Central General Hosp. v. De Laurentis,</i> 1978 WL 1733 (E.D.N.Y. March 9, 1978)	13
20	<i>ChampionsWorld, LLC v. United States Soccer Fed., Inc.,</i> 487 F.Supp.2d 980 (N.D. Ill.2007)	11
21	<i>Comedy Club, Inc. v. Improv W. Assocs.,</i> 553 F.3d 1277 (9th Cir. 2009)	17
23	<i>Cox v. Piper, Jaffray & Hopwood, Inc.,</i> 848 F.2d 842 (8th Cir.1988)	10
24	<i>Crawford Group, Inc. v. Holekamp,</i> 543 F.3d 971 (8th Cir. 2008)	16
26	<i>Crim v. Pepperidge Farm, Inc.,</i> 32 F.Supp.2d 326 (D. Md.1999)	11
27	<i>Diemaco v. Colt's M'fring Co.,</i> 11 F.Supp.2d 228 (D.Conn. 1998)	11, 18

1	<i>Fidelity Federal Bank, FSB v. Durga Ma Corp.</i> , 386 F.3d 1306 (9th Cir. 2004)	8, 14, 25
2	<i>French v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.</i> , 784 F.2d 902 (9th Cir.1986)	17
3	<i>G.C. and K.B. Inv., Inc. v.. Wilson</i> , 326 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir.2003)	17
4	<i>Gulf Guar. Life Ins. Co. v. Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 304 F.3d 376 (5th Cir.2002)	10
5	<i>Haworth v. Superior Court</i> , 50 Cal.4th 372 (2010)	27
6	<i>In re Wal-Mart Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litig.</i> , 2011 WL 887556 (D. Nev. March 14, 2011)	18
7	<i>Kyocera Corp. v. Prudential-Bache Trade Services, Inc.</i> , 341 F.3d 987 (9th Cir.2003)	17
8	<i>Lagstein v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's, London</i> , 607 F .3d 634 (9th Cir.2010)	17
9	<i>Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Stanford Hospital Clinics v. U.S. Nursing Corp.</i> , 2002 WL 1162390 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2002)	23
10	<i>Michaels v. Mariforum Shipping, S.A.</i> , 624 F.2d 411 (2d Cir.1980)	10
11	<i>Middlesex Mutual Ins. Co. v. Levine</i> , 675 F.2d 1197 (4th Cir.1982)	23
12	<i>Merit Ins. Co. v. Leatherby Ins. Co.</i> , 714 F.2d 673 (7th Cir. 1983)	16, 21, 23, 25
13	<i>Metropolitan Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. J.C. Penney Cas. Ins. Co.</i> , 780 F.Supp. 885 (D. Conn.1991)	15
14	<i>Mt. Holyoke Homes L.P. v. Jeffer Mangels Butler & Mitchell</i> , 2013 WL 5321158 (Cal. App. Sep. 24, 2013)	27
15	<i>Nemecek & Cole v. Horn</i> , 208 Cal.App.4th 641 (2012)	27
16	<i>New Regency Productions, Inc. v. Nippon Herald Films, Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir. 2007)	4, 5, 20, 21
17	<i>Nordahl Development Corp., Inc. v. Salomon Smith Barney</i> , 309 F.Supp.2d 1257 (D. Or. 2004)	23
18	<i>Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter</i> 33 S.Ct. 2064 (2013)	2, 3, 15, 16, 18

1	<i>Pacific Reinsurance Mgmt. Corp. v. Ohio Reinsurance Corp.</i> , 935 F.2d. 1019 (9th Cir. 1991)	14
2	<i>Positive Software Solutions, Inc. v. New Century Mortgage Corp.</i> , 476 F.3d 278 (5th Cir. 2007)	5, 21
3	<i>Sanko S.S. Co. v. Cook Industries, Inc.</i> , 495 F.2d 1260 (2d Cir.1973)	14
4	<i>Scandinavian Reinsurance Co. Ltd. v. Saint Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co.</i> , 668 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2012)	22
5	<i>Schmitz v. Zilveti</i> , 20 F.3d 1043 (9 th Cir. 1994)	23
6	<i>Service Partners, LLC v. American Home Assur. Co.</i> , 2011 WL 2516411 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2011)	11
7	<i>Smith v. Am. Arbitration Ass'n</i> , 233 F.3d 502 (7th Cir. 2000)	11, 10, 12
8	<i>Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds Int'l Corp.</i> , 130 S.Ct. 1758 (2010).	17
9	<i>Sussex v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers LLC</i> 2013 WL 1855797 (D. Nev. May 1, 2013)	1, 12
10	<i>Titan Pharmaceuticals and Nutrition, Inc. v. Medicine Shoppe Intern., Inc.</i> , 2006 WL 626051 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 13, 2006)	10
11	<i>Thomas v. City of North Las Vegas</i> , 122 Nev. 82 (2006)	27, 28
12	<i>Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Cunard Line, Ltd.</i> 943 F.2d 1056 (9th Cir.1991)	17
13	Statutes:	
14	9 U.S.C. § 10(a)	1, 11, 14, 15, 16
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendants' Motion to disqualify Arbitrator Hare is procedurally defective, legally
 3 infirm, and substantively meritless. As a result the motion most certainly must
 4 respectfully be denied.

5 **A. The Motion is Procedurally Defective**

6 Judge Du already ruled in this case that "the time to challenge an arbitration, on
 7 whatever grounds, including bias, is when the arbitration is completed and an award
 8 rendered", 2013 WL 1855797 at * 2 (D. Nev. May 1, 2013), quoting *Smith v. Am.*
 9 *Arbitration Ass'n., Inc.*, 233 F.3d 502, 506 (7th Cir. 2000). Judge Du also cited 9 U.S.C.
 10 § 10(a)(2) which similarly provides that the time to seek relief from "evident partiality or
 11 corruption in the arbitrators" is after an arbitration award is rendered.

12 Due to the fact that no arbitration award has been issued in this case, Defendants'
 13 motion for an order disqualifying Arbitrator Hare now is procedurally defective as this
 14 Court does not have jurisdiction at this time to even consider reviewing a claim of evident
 15 partiality of the arbitrator before the issuance of an award as a matter of law. There is
 16 nothing the Defendants can say or do that can change these uncontested facts and law.

17 Notably, Defendants cannot even cite to a single authority where the alleged evident
 18 partiality no matter how "extreme" would nevertheless allow the Court to entertain a
 19 challenge to the arbitrator before the arbitration is completed and an award is rendered.
 20 Such a ruling would violate the express language of 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(2) which requires
 21 an award to be made as a prerequisite for a determination of evident partiality.

22 Defendants' heavy reliance on *Aerojet-General Corp. v. American Arbitration*
 23 *Assoc.*, 478 F.2d 248 (9th Cir. 1973) is completely misplaced. *Aerojet-General* involved
 24 the venue of the proceedings and did not involve the partiality of the arbitrator.
 25 Interlocutory review was possible because denial of change of venue caused irreparable
 26 injury which could not be remedied after the award since venue, unlike evident partiality
 27 is not a basis for vacating an award under the FAA.

1 Given the uncontested facts and law, the motion to disqualify Arbitrator Hare
 2 without there being an award is procedural defective. As a result the motion must be
 3 denied as a matter of law.

4 **B. The Motion is Legally Infirm**

5 The Motion challenges the legality of the decision of the AAA Administrative
 6 Review Council (“AAA Council”) reaffirming the selection of Arbitrator Hare as the
 7 arbitrator over the objections of the Respondents based on the Arbitrators alleged failure
 8 to make required disclosures under NRS 38.227 which Defendants claim establishes his
 9 evident partiality. The Defendants contractually agreed in the Purchase and Sale
 10 Agreement at paragraph 24.10 that "the arbitration process shall be the exclusive means
 11 for resolving disputes the parties cannot resolve" under the Dispute Resolution Rules of
 12 the American Arbitration Association.

13 Importantly, the Defendants voluntarily chose to present their claim of evident
 14 partiality now rather than later and before the AAA Council and not before this Court. In
 15 so doing the Defendants voluntarily agreed to accept the decision of the AAA Council in
 16 accordance with the AAA Rules. AAA Rule R-17 (b) states that "Upon objection of any
 17 party to the continued service of an arbitrator, or on its own initiative, the AAA shall
 18 determine whether the arbitrator shall be disqualified under the grounds set out above, and
 19 shall inform the parties of its decision, which decision shall be conclusive". The United
 20 States Supreme Court in the unanimous decision of *Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter*
 133 S.Ct. 2064 (2013) held that “because the parties ‘bargained for the arbitrator’s
 22 construction of their agreement,’ an arbitral decision ‘even arguably construing or
 23 applying the contract’ must stand, regardless of the court’s view of its (de)merits.....Only
 24 if ‘the arbitrator act[s] outside the scope of his **contractually delegated authority**’...may
 25 a court overturn his determination”. *Id.* at 2068.

26 Therefore where, as here, the AAA Council acted within the scope its contractual
 27 authority under the AAA Rules as adopted by the parties and as requested by the
 28

1 Defendants, there can be no court reversal of the AAA Council's determination. Under
 2 *Oxford Health*, this Court is without the power to reverse the AAA Council's ruling now
 3 that the AAA Council has ruled based on the request of the Defendants and the parties'
 4 agreement that the AAA Council's ruling would be "conclusive". As a result, any
 5 reversal of the decision of the AAA Council to reaffirm Arbitrator Hare would be contrary
 6 to the law as set forth in *Oxford Health*. Simply stated, this Court, respectfully, as a result
 7 of the unanimous decision in *Oxford Health*, is required to enforce the arbitration clause
 8 of the contract as written and implemented by the parties. Therefore once the Defendants
 9 sought a ruling and obtained one from the AAA Council within the scope of the AAA
 10 Council's authority under AAA Rule R-17, this Court was stripped of all its power to
 11 overturn the decision of the AAA Council under *Oxford Health* as the Defendants agreed
 12 that the decision of the Council would be "conclusive".

13 There is no argument here that the AAA Council is evidently partial. Therefore the
 14 analysis of the evident partiality of Arbitrator Hare begins and ends with the conclusive
 15 decision of the AAA Council, within the scope of the AAA Council's authority, as per the
 16 arbitration agreement as implemented by the Defendants. Defendants chose to present
 17 this issue to the AAA Council and in so doing agreed to accept the decision of the
 18 Council as "conclusive" and "conclusive" means "conclusive."

19 Therefore, any review by this Court of the substance of the decision of the AAA
 20 Council would, respectfully, be legally infirm in light of *Oxford Health* and the
 21 contractual agreements of the parties because the AAA Council acted within the scope of
 22 its authority. Accordingly, Defendants' motion to disqualify Arbitrator Hare must be
 23 denied for this additional reason.

24 **C. The Motion is Substantively Meritless.**

25 Even if this Court had the power to second guess the conclusive decision of the AAA
 26 Council, Defendants cannot show that there was any information that was not disclosed,
 27 or that if there was information that was not disclosed that the information gives rise to a
 28

reasonable impression of partiality. Moreover, by agreeing to the application of the AAA Rules, this Court would be required to interpret Arbitrator Hare's disclosure under AAA Rules. This brings the substantive determination full circle and requires this Court under the applicable law to give deference to the decision of the AAA Council as "conclusive."

Notably, this Court should be aware of the fact that Arbitrator Hare was not picked by the parties but rather was selected by the AAA without any input from the parties. This occurred as a result of the parties not agreeing to the selection from any of the arbitrators offered by the AAA. As a result any alleged nondisclosure would have no bearing on his selection as the parties were not free to strike Arbitrator Hare as the arbitrator. Therefore the alleged nondisclosure would have to be judged based on evidence of actual bias as the alleged nondisclosure was not a part of the selection process and Arbitrator Hare's relationship with Bowdoin was in fact disclosed during the arbitration process. As can be determined from the evidence set forth in the Statement of Facts herein there is absolutely no allegations of actual bias or any claim that the Arbitrator has any relationship whatsoever with any party to this action or their counsel.

Even if this Court were to evaluate evident partiality under the rubric of nondisclosure, the result would be the same because the Ninth Circuit applies the same standard for evident partiality and actual bias. *New Regency Productions, Inc. v. Nippon Herald Films, Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1101, 110 (9th Cir. 2007). As the Ninth Circuit explained in *New Regency*, nondisclosure can be the basis for disqualification or vacatur of an arbitral award only “**if the conflict left undisclosed was real ... and ‘not trivial’.**” *Id.* at 1110, quoting *ANR Coal Co., Inc. v. Cogentrix of North Carolina, Inc.*, 173 F.3d 493 (4th Cir. 1999).¹

¹ Emphasis added unless otherwise stated. *ANR Coal* held that disqualification requires **evidence of partiality that is “direct, definite and capable of demonstration rather than remote, uncertain or speculative.”** 173 F.3d 493. The court should consider four factors; “(1) the extent and character of the personal interest, pecuniary or otherwise, of the arbitrator in

1 In *Positive Software Solutions, Inc. v. New Century Mortgage Corp.*, 476 F.3d 278,
 2 284 (5th Cir.2007), which the Ninth Circuit followed in *New Regency*, the Court of Appeal
 3 found that “**nondisclosure alone does not require vacatur of an arbitral award for**
 4 **evident partiality. An arbitrator's failure to disclose must involve a significant**
 5 **compromising connection to the parties.**” 476 F.3d at 282-83.

6 In this case, Defendant fails to show **any relationship whatsoever** between
 7 Arbitrator Hare and any of the parties or their counsel. As a result the motion to disqualify
 8 Arbitrator Hare is meritless. Therefore, the motion must be denied for this additional
 9 reason.

10

11 II. STATEMENT OF FACTS

12 Arbitrator Hare was appointed by AAA according to AAA policies and procedures
 13 after the parties could not agree on the selection of an arbitrator. As such, neither
 14 Plaintiffs nor Defendants could have "stricken" Arbitrator Hare. The AAA Council, at
 15 Defendants' request, has already reviewed the appointment of Arbitrator Hare based on
 16 Defendants' claim of nondisclosure and "determined that the Arbitrator shall be
 17 reaffirmed in this case." See Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Norman B. Blumenthal
 18 ("Blum. Dec.") filed herewith.

19 Defendants do not claim that there is any actual bias or any relationship between
 20 Arbitrator Hare and any party or their counsel. Defendants instead argue that the
 21 Arbitrator's experience in a specific area of law somehow renders him partial, even where
 22 there is no relationship to the parties or the claims in dispute. There is no evidence that
 23 Plaintiffs or their counsel have any relationship with Bowdoin Street Capital or Arbitrator
 24 Hare or that Bowdoin Street Capital or Arbitrator Hare have any financial interest in the
 25

26 the proceeding; (2) the directness of the relationship between the arbitrator and the party he is
 27 alleged to favor; (3) the connection of that relationship to the arbitration; and (4) the proximity
 28 in time between the relationship and the arbitration proceeding.” *Id.* Here, Arbitrator Hare has
 no personal interest in this arbitration, pecuniary or otherwise and no relationship with any party.

1 outcome of this arbitration, or that Plaintiffs or their counsel attended any conference at
 2 which Arbitrator Hare served as a panelist. There is simply no evidence of any
 3 compromising connection or material nondisclosure by Arbitrator Hare, Plaintiffs or
 4 Plaintiffs' counsel in this case or of any impropriety whatsoever. Arbitrator Hare had
 5 no obligation to make any disclosures specifically about Bowdoin Street Capital, in that
 6 the information concerning a dormant business with no financial relations would not give
 7 rise to a reasonable impression of partiality or any compromising relationship. Moreover,
 8 the prospective practice area of Bowdoin is included within the disclosed practice areas
 9 of Hare & Associates of evaluating litigation claims and representing the interests of
 10 plaintiffs in large class action cases. In a February 26, 2010 email, AAA disclosed
 11 Arbitrator Hare's resume ("Hare Resume") to Defendants. The Hare Resume disclosed in
 12 pertinent part:

13 Over 30 years experience litigating the full spectrum of commercial and
 14 legal issues arising in the computer, communications, controls and alarm
 15 industries. Prosecutes and defends claims involving hardware and software
 16 vendors. **Has assessed several hundred computer-related disputes from**
both plaintiff and defense standpoints. He acted as an adviser to
 17 multinational computer and controls companies and provided litigation
 18 management services nationally for a prominent manufacturer. **Represents**
plaintiffs in a putative class action against one of the nation's largest
mortgage servicers and defendant high tech manufacturer in a putative
 class action brought for alleged pollution and stigma damage to real
 property.

19 See Exhibit 2 to Blum Dec.

20 After this disclosure, Defendants stated that they had no objection to Arbitrator
 21 Hare. As a result, Defendants also waived their objection when they failed to object to his
 22 representation of plaintiffs in class actions after receiving the Hare Resume.

23 A. **Arbitrator Hare Has No Financial Interest or Relationship With Any**
Party or Their Counsel or the Claims in this Arbitration

25 As required by the Parties' arbitration agreement, Arbitrator Hare was initially
 26 reviewed by the AAA and appointed by the AAA according to AAA policies and
 27 procedures after the parties could not agree on the selection of an arbitrator pursuant to
 28 AAA Rule R-11(b). As such, neither Plaintiffs nor Defendants could have "stricken"

1 Arbitrator Hare at the time of his appointment. The AAA, after its initial review and
 2 appointment of Arbitrator Hare, subsequently reviewed the appointment of Arbitrator Hare
 3 for a second time and "determined that Arbitrator Hare will be reaffirmed as arbitrator"
 4 of the parties' dispute.

5 The undisputed facts are that there is **no** evidence of any relationship whatsoever
 6 between Arbitrator Hare and any party or their counsel, and neither Hare & Associates nor
 7 Bowdoin Street Capital have any relationship, whatsoever, with any party or their counsel.
 8 Finally, no one disputes that Hare & Associates is Arbitrator Hare's active law practice,
 9 and that Bowdoin Street Capital is a company that "has been completely dormant", has
 10 "raised no money" and has "no investments." See Exhibit 3 to Blum Dec. In fact, there
 11 is **no** evidence that the Arbitrator has any direct or indirect relationship with any party or
 12 its counsel, or any interest, financial or otherwise, in the outcome of this arbitration.
 13

14 **B. Arbitrator Hare's Experience and Practice In Representing Plaintiffs,**
 15 **Consumers and Mortgagors Was Fully Disclosed**

16 Defendants claims that they were unaware that Arbitrator Hare represented the
 17 interests of plaintiffs, "such as the [] claimants in this arbitration," and that this knowledge
 18 creates a "reasonable impression of partiality." What the Defendants conspicuously ignore
 19 is that in the February 26, 2010 email, the AAA fully disclosed Arbitrator Hare's Resume
 20 to Defendants. See Exhibit 2 to Blum. Dec. The Hare Resume fully disclosed his active
 21 law practice as the managing partner of Hare & Associates and prior to that at Hare &
 22 Chaffin, which included representation of plaintiffs' interests in class actions. *Id.*

23 The Hare Resume also reveals that for over twenty (20) years as a managing partner
 24 of Hare & Associates and Hare & Chaffin, Arbitrator Hare has "assessed several hundred
 25 computer-related disputes from both **the plaintiff** and defense stand point." *Id.* More
 26 particularly, the Hare Resume indicates that Mr. Hare "[r]epresents plaintiffs in a
 27 **putative class action** against one of the nation's largest mortgage servicers". *Id.* Thus,
 28 the Arbitrator's representation of the interests of plaintiffs, consumers, and mortgagors in

1 a class action against a corporate defendant, and his experience in assessing litigation
 2 "from both plaintiff and defense standpoints" was fully and expressly disclosed on
 3 February 26, 2010.

4 With this disclosure, the AAA instructed the parties to submit "any objections to
 5 the appointment of Arbitrator Hare by March 5, 2010." See Exhibit 2 to Blum Decl.
 6 Respondent did not object to Arbitrator Hare's appointment, even though his firm's
 7 representation of plaintiffs, consumers and mortgagors was disclosed, along with
 8 Arbitrator Hare's practice of assessing and evaluating litigation claims for plaintiffs.

9 Now, Defendants, after their motion to dismiss in arbitration was denied by
 10 Arbitrator Hare, disingenuously claim that they were not aware that Arbitrator Hare
 11 represents not only the interests of defendants but also the interests of plaintiffs in class
 12 actions. This simply is not true. The true facts are that Arbitrator Hare's representation
 13 of plaintiffs, consumers and mortgagors, "such as the [] claimants in this arbitration," was
 14 fully disclosed. Defendants' contention to the contrary is belied by the specific
 15 disclosures in Arbitrator Hare's resume of his law practice covering these issues. After
 16 this disclosure, Respondent made no objection by March 5, 2010 based on the fact that
 17 Arbitrator Hare had interests aligned with plaintiffs and consumers in a class action and
 18 had assessed cases from both the plaintiff and defense standpoints.²

19 **C. Information Concerning Bowdoin Street Capital Could Not Create a**
Reasonable Impression of Partiality

21 Notably, Defendants' contention is not that Plaintiffs or their attorneys have a
 22 relationship, financial or otherwise, with Bowdoin Street Capital. Defendants' contention
 23 is that the mere existence of a dormant company "to explore the possibility of raising a
 24 fund to provide capital for litigation" that did no business shows a bias or partiality in

25 _____
 26 ² Respondent should therefore not be permitted to now object based upon these
 27 same grounds because these interests of Arbitrator Hare were fully disclosed. *Fidelity*
Federal Bank, FSB v. Durga Ma Corp., 386 F.3d 1306, 1313 (9th Cir. 2004) (objection
 28 to arbitrator's evident partiality is waived where party knew or should have known facts
 on which objection is based but fails to timely object).

1 favor of plaintiffs in general because plaintiffs are usually the parties who seek litigation
2 financing. The problems with Defendants' attenuated and strained argument are that not
3 only was the Arbitrator's interest in representing the interests of plaintiffs, consumers and
4 mortgagors in litigation -- along with the Arbitrator's involvement in assessing cases --
5 fully disclosed on February 26, 2010 in his resume without objection from Defendants, but
6 also that Defendants' argument is without any merit. Practicing law for the benefit of both
7 plaintiffs and defendants does not show partiality. Otherwise a practitioner who represents
8 both plaintiffs and defendants could never be an arbitrator in any case, which is simply not
9 the law.

10 Indeed, a reasonable impression of partiality cannot not be created by the fact that
11 Arbitrator Hare has represented the interests of plaintiffs and consumers, in addition to his
12 representation of corporate defendants. Defendants' facts set forth nothing more than a
13 repetition of information already disclosed in the Hare Resume. The fact that Arbitrator
14 Hare has "over 30 years' experience litigating the full spectrum of commercial and
15 corporate legal issues" (Hare Resume, Exhibit 2), is not "likely to give rise to justifiable
16 doubt as to the arbitrator's impartiality."

17 The undisputed facts are that Bowdoin Street Capital was a dormant entity that
18 engaged in no business, engaged in no financing of lawsuits, and possessed no
19 relationships with any of the parties to this arbitration. To the point, Arbitrator Hare's
20 presentations in April 2011 and in May 2012, were made as the senior partner of "Hare
21 & Associates" and addressed issues germane to and experienced by every law firm that
22 represents plaintiffs and defendants or assesses the value of cases for either or both.
23 Thus, the substance of what Defendants' now raise as an objection was, in fact, disclosed
24 in the Hare Resume. Indeed, assessing cases for potential financing is a mere subset of
25 the practice of assessing cases for the interests of plaintiffs and defendants that was
26 disclosed in the Hare Resume.

27 Defendants attack on the Arbitrator's disclosure based upon the dormant Bowdoin
28

1 therefore presents no new material information, as Arbitrator Hare already disclosed Hare
 2 & Associates' involvement in representing the interests of plaintiffs in litigation, including
 3 litigation involving real estate on behalf of mortgagors, and assessment of disputes from
 4 a plaintiff's standpoint. Thus, there is no new information, beyond what was presented to
 5 Defendants in the February 26, 2010 email and resume, which would give rise to
 6 Defendants' sudden objections which are now three years too late and have no substantive
 7 merit.

8

9 **III. THE MOTION IS PROCEDURALLY DEFECTIVE**

10 Federal case law is well-established that a party to arbitration may seek judicial
 11 review of an arbitrators' claimed bias only at the conclusion of the arbitration as a grounds
 12 for vacating an arbitral award, and only in the Court that ordered the arbitration. *Smith v.*
 13 *Am. Arbitration Ass'n*, 233 F.3d 502, 506 (7th Cir. 2000); *Gulf Guar. Life Ins. Co. v.*
 14 *Conn. Gen. Life Ins. Co.*, 304 F.3d 376, 490 (5th Cir. 2002) ("where arbitrator bias is at
 15 issue, the FAA does not provide for removal of an arbitrator from service prior to an
 16 award, but only for potential vacatur of any award."). *ANR Coal Co., Inc. v. Cogentrix of*
 17 *North Carolina, Inc.*, 173 F.3d 493, 497 (4th Cir. 1999); *Cox v. Piper, Jaffray &*

18 *Hopwood, Inc.*, 848 F.2d 842, 843–44 (8th Cir. 1988) ("Appellants cannot obtain judicial
 19 review of the [AAA's] decisions about the qualifications of arbitrators or other matters
 20 prior to the making of an award."); *Aviall, Inc. v. Ryder Sys., Inc.*, 110 F.3d 892, 895 (2d
 21 Cir. 1997); *Michaels v. Mariforum Shipping, S.A.*, 624 F.2d 411, 414 n. 4 (2d Cir. 1980) ("[I]t is well established that a district court cannot entertain an attack upon the
 22 qualifications or partiality of arbitrators until after the conclusion of the arbitration and the
 23 rendition of an award"); *Blue Cross Blue Shield of Tennessee v. BCS Ins. Co.*, 517
 24 F.Supp.2d 1050, 1060–1061 (N.D. Ill. 2007) ("The proper way to raise a bias objection
 25 is by challenging the arbitration award, once the arbitration is complete."); *Titan*
 26 *Pharmaceuticals and Nutrition, Inc. v. Medicine Shoppe Intern., Inc.*, 2006 WL 626051,
 27

28

1 *6 and n. 68 (S.D.N.Y. Mar 13, 2006) (This Court's authority to remedy arbitrator bias
 2 is limited to setting aside the award after it has been rendered."); *Brandon, Jones,*
 3 *Sandall, Zeide, Kohn, Chalal & Musso, P.A. v. MedPartners, Inc.*, 203 F.R.D. 677 (S.D.
 4 Fla. 2001), aff'd 312 F.3d 1349 (11th Cir. 2002); *Diemaco v. Colt's M'fring Co.*, 11
 5 F.Supp.2d 228, 231–32 (D. Conn.1998); *Crim v. Pepperidge Farm, Inc.*, 32 F.Supp.2d
 6 326, 330 (D. Md.1999).

7 As the district court explained in *Service Partners, LLC v. American Home Assur.*
 8 *Co.*, 2011 WL 2516411 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2011):

9 **"It is well established** that a district court cannot entertain an attack upon
 10 the qualifications of or partiality of arbitrators until after the conclusion of
 11 the arbitration and the rendition of an award." "By its own terms, [9 U.S.C
 12 .] § 10 authorizes court action only after a final award is made by the
 13 arbitrator.". Further, "**even where arbitrator bias is at issue, the FAA**
 14 **does not provide for removal of an arbitrator from service prior to an**
 15 **award, but only for potential vacatur of any award.**"

16 *Id.* at *5 . (citations omitted)

17 Section 10(a) of the Federal Arbitration Act which governs judicial review of
 18 arbitrations give a federal court jurisdiction to review and vacate **arbitration awards** on
 19 grounds including "**evident partiality** or corruption in the arbitrators, or either of them."
 20 9 U.S.C.A. § 10(a)(2). Accordingly, a claim of **evident partiality** is not subject to judicial
 21 review until **after an award** has been entered. The argument that a party may
 22 preemptively seek judicial review of an arbitrator's claimed **evident partiality** before an
 23 award is issued

24 **is a non-starter**, however, because ChampionsWorld fails to identify any
 25 jurisdictional basis on which this Court could prospectively nullify a
 26 potential arbitration award. The Act only provides for review of the fairness
 27 and procedural adequacy of an arbitration after it has occurred. **The Act's**
 28 **silence on the notion of doing so beforehand is dispositive.**

29 *ChampionsWorld, LLC v. United States Soccer Fed., Inc.*, 487 F.Supp.2d 980, 991 (N.D.
 30 Ill. 2007).

31 This rule embodies the strong federal policy reflected in the FAA against
 32 interlocutory meddling arbitration proceedings. **Defendants' attempt to evade this rule**

1 by seeking interlocutory disqualification in state court would cause grave injury to
 2 this important federal policy. Chief Judge Easterbrook states as follows:

3 If a party could run to court and contest every procedural ruling that
 4 it believes is erroneous and not squarely covered by the contract (which
 5 rarely tells arbitrators what procedures to use), arbitration would fail
 6 to offer an attractive alternative to litigation. Litigation usually entails
 7 only one proceeding in the district court, followed by one appeal. If BCS
 8 were right, however, every arbitration could be contested (with an
 appeal) before it begins; every supposed procedural error could be
 contested in a separate suit (with another appeal) in mid-arbitration;
 and then the outcome could be contested in a proceeding to confirm or
 vacate the award, with yet another appeal. That would make
 arbitration both interminable and impossibly expensive.

9 *Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc. v. BCS Ins. Co.*, 671 F.3d 635, 638 (7th Cir.
 10 2011).

11 Judge Du agreed that "the time to challenge an arbitration, on whatever grounds,
 12 including bias, is when the arbitration is completed and an award rendered" *Sussex v.*
 13 *Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers LLC*, 2013 WL 1855797 at * 2, quoting *Smith v. Am.*
 14 *Arbitration Ass'n., Inc.*, 233 F.3d 502, 506 (7th Cir. 2000).

15 None of the cases cited by Defendants in their motion to disqualify Arbitrator Hare
 16 hold to the contrary. **Defendants has failed to cite a single case where alleged**
 17 **arbitrator bias or failure to disclose provided a basis for pre-award disqualification.**
 18 Defendants' heavy reliance on *Aerojet-General Corp. v. American Arbitration Assoc.*, 478
 19 F.2d 248 (9th Cir. 1973) is misplaced. *Aerojet* addressed an action where it was alleged
 20 by one of the parties to the arbitration agreement that the AAA's reaffirmation of the
 21 arbitrator's choice of New York as a **locale** for arbitration of a contractual dispute between
 22 the parties was arbitrary and unreasonable. *Aerojet*, at 250. After the AAA concluded that
 23 the arbitration should be held in New York, the appellee immediately sued in the district
 24 court in California and obtained an ex parte order temporarily restraining the AAA from
 25 conducting the arbitration in New York and one of the parties appealed the district court's
 26 ruling. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit noted that "**[t]o permit what is in effect an appeal of an**
 27 **interlocutory ruling of the arbitrator would frustrate" the fundamental purpose of**
 28

1 arbitration which is “the speedy disposition of disputes without the expense and delay
 2 of extended court proceedings.” *Id.* at 251. The court further noted that error in failing
 3 to transfer from a bad faith choice of venue could provide a narrow exception to this rule
 4 because it could cause severe irreparable injury as “error in denying a change of **venue**
 5 cannot effectively be remedied on appeal from final judgment.” *Id.* As the *Aerojet* court
 6 explained,

7 Extreme cases can be imagined in which the choice of **locale** for arbitration
 8 is not made in good faith and **severe irreparable injury** is inflicted on one
 9 or more of the parties. In such case the courts should be free to prevent a
 10 manifest injustice. For this reason we decline to hold that immediate
 11 judicial review of a ruling setting the place for arbitration is never justified.
Cf. Pacific Car & Foundry, Inc. v. Pence, supra. **Only an extreme case could warrant such judicial review, and this is emphatically not such a case.**

12 *Id.*

13 The Ninth Circuit in fact reversed the district court’s ruling and dissolved the
 14 preliminary injunction ruling that the injunction to enjoin the proceedings was not
 15 justified. Unlike venue,

16 an arbitrator’s qualifications can be effectively challenged after a final award and indeed
 17 is only subject to judicial review at that time under the FAA.

18 In the forty years since *Aerojet* was decided every court that has ever applied
 19 *Aerojet* in the context of attempted interlocutory review of an arbitrators’ qualifications
 20 has held that claimed arbitrator bias does not come within the narrow *Aerojet* exception
 21 to the rule against interlocutory review. As the district court held in *Central General*
 22 *Hosp. v. De Laurentis*, 1978 WL 1733 (E.D.N.Y. March 9, 1978):

23 There are **three important policy reasons for not permitting an**
arbitrator's partiality to be attacked prior to his rendering an award.
First, where, as here, the arbitrator has been contractually agreed upon
by the parties, the court should be reluctant to upset that contractual
arrangement [aside]. Secondly, such an attack is premature since the
arbitrator may act fairly and impartially in rendering his award
notwithstanding the attacking party's suspicions as to his bias. Thirdly,
to allow a pre-award attack on an arbitrator would be to do a disservice
to the policy behind arbitration, which is to encourage the speedy
disposition of disputes without the expense and delay of protracted
court proceedings. See *Aerojet-General Corp. v. American Arbitration*

Association, 478 F.2d 248, 251 (9th Cir. 1973).

2 || *Id.* at *8, n. 4.

3 In *Application of York Hannover Holding A.G. v. American Arbitration Ass'n.*,
4 1993 WL 159961, *5 (S.D.N.Y. May 11, 1993) the district court found that alleged
5 arbitrator bias did not come within the *Aerojet* exception because it would not cause
6 “severe irreparable injury” *Id.* at *5, quoting *Aerojet*, 478 F.2d at 252. As the district court
7 also recognized “**where the applicable rules of arbitration require that an independent**
8 **panel or board handle and determine complaints of arbitrator bias or impartiality,**
9 **the decision of that panel ‘will generally be reviewable by a district court only after**
10 **an award has been made.’” *Id.* at *2, quoting *Sanko S.S. Co. v. Cook Industries, Inc.*, 495
11 F.2d 1260, 1264 n. 4 (2d Cir.1973).³**

Defendants cite *Pacific Reinsurance Mgmt. Corp. v. Ohio Reinsurance Corp.*, 935 F.2d. 1019 (9th Cir. 1991) to argue that this Court has jurisdiction to review an arbitrators qualifications before a final award. In *Pacific Reinsurance*, however, the Ninth Circuit did not address arbitrator disqualification but instead held that a temporary restraining order issued by the arbitrator must be treated as a final award under the FAA. *Pacific Reinsurance* is inapposite because there is no temporary restraining order or final award in this case. Instead this motion involves a claim of evident partiality, which under 9 USC § 10(a)(2) cannot be reviewed until after a final award.⁴

³ In *Application of York Hannover Holding*, the district court noted that New York state law allowed equitable interlocutory review of arbitrators' qualifications. As the Ninth Circuit has held, however, review of arbitrator bias in federal court is governed by federal law not state law. *Fidelity Federal Bank, FSB v. Durga Ma Corp.*, 386 F.3d 1306, 1313 (9th Cir. 2004).

⁴ Defendants' disingenuous attempt to create the impression that *Pacific Reinsurance* actually addressed arbitrator disqualification by inserting their own bracketed language into the middle of a parenthetical quote from *Pacific Reinsurance* speaks volumes about the lack of any genuine legal support for their motion. See Defendants' Brief page 13, n. 5.

1 *Metropolitan Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. J.C. Penney Cas. Ins. Co.*, 780 F.Supp. 885
 2 (D. Conn. 1991), which Defendants cite, also did not involve disqualification of an
 3 arbitrator by federal court but instead addressed the remand of a case to state court. The
 4 court's speculation in dicta that an interlocutory injunction against an arbitration based on
 5 arbitrator misconduct might be permissible is incorrect because it ignores the governing
 6 FAA rules and federal case law. As another district court observed in holding that there
 7 was no jurisdiction to review an arbitrator's qualifications or conduct until after a final
 8 award, the *Metropolitan Prop.* court's dicta "**is supported by neither the text of the**
 9 **FAA or the Convention Act, nor federal case law.**" *Burlington Ins. Co. v. Trygg-Hansa*
 10 *Ins. Co.*, AB, 2002 WL 855911, *2, n. 2 (M.D.N.C. April 19, 2002). Accordingly, the
 11 motion is procedurally defective and must be denied as a matter of law.

12

13 **IV. THE MOTION IS LEGALLY INFIRM**

14 The AAA Rules, which the parties agreed would apply in the arbitration agreement,
 15 compel the same result. Rule R-17(b) provides that the AAA's ruling on a claim of
 16 arbitrator bias shall be "**conclusive.**" Accordingly, by contractually agreeing to be bound
 17 by the AAA's Rules the parties have agreed that there will be no right to judicial review
 18 of the substance of the AAA Council's ruling on a motion to disqualify an arbitrator.
 19 Under Section 10(a)(2) of the FAA the alleged bias of an arbitrator can only be reviewed
 20 in a motion to vacate a final award. **Under *Oxford Health*, the only issue subject to**
 21 **timely judicial review will be whether the AAA Council acted within the scope of its**
 22 **contractually-delegated authority. Defendants do not dispute that the AAA Council**
 23 **acted within the scope of its contractually-delegated authority. Therefore, the AAA**
 24 **Council's determination cannot be overturned.**

25 The courts have also consistently ruled that by agreeing to be bound by AAA rules
 26 the parties to an arbitration agree that the AAA's ruling on a motion to disqualify is
 27 conclusive and can only be reviewed under the deferential standard for vacatur.
 28

1 Because the Agreement explicitly states that arbitration would be conducted
 2 in accordance with the Commercial Arbitration Rules of the American
 3 Arbitration Association (AAA Rules), the parties agreed to the method
 4 provided by the rules for the resolution of disputes concerning the
 5 disqualification of arbitrators. Pursuant to Rule 17(b) of the AAA Rules, the
 6 parties designated the AAA to decide the issue in the first instance. Rule
 7 17(b) provides that: "Upon objection of a party to the continued service of
 8 an arbitrator, or on its own initiative, the AAA shall determine whether the
 9 arbitrator should be disqualified ... which decision shall be conclusive." **The**
 10 **district court thus reviewed the AAA's decision under the deferential**
 11 **standards for vacatur of the ensuing arbitration award, and we do the**
 12 **same.**

13 *Crawford Group, Inc. v. Holekamp*, 543 F.3d 971, 976 (8th Cir. 2008); see also *Merit Ins.*
 14 *Co. v. Leatherby Ins. Co.*, 714 F.2d 673, 680 (7th Cir. 1983) ("the Commercial Arbitration
 15 Rules makes the AAA itself the final arbiter of disqualification once the arbitrator has
 16 been appointed, subject only (so far as relevant here) to the limited judicial review allowed
 17 by section 10 of the Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 10, after an arbitration award is made and
 18 judicial confirmation of it sought.")⁵

19 When properly reviewed after an award has been issued, the decision of the AAA
 20 that an arbitrator has no evident partiality and should not be disqualified is reviewed
 21 **"under the deferential standards for vacatur of the ensuing arbitration award."**

22 *Crawford Group, Inc. v. Holekamp*, *supra*, 543 F.3d at 976; see also *Merit Ins. Co. v.*
 23 *Leatherby Ins. Co.*, 714 F.2d 673, 680. Under *Oxford Health*, the AAA Council's
 24 determination that Arbitrator Hare is not evidently partial must therefore be upheld even
 25 after a final award because the AAA Council acted within the scope of its contractually-
 26 delegated authority.

27 Under the Federal Arbitration Act, a district court may issue "an order vacating the
 28 award upon the application of any party to the arbitration ... where the arbitrators exceeded
 29 their powers." 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(4). Arbitrators do not "exceed their powers" when they

26 ⁵ N.R.S 38.241, the Nevada statute upon which Defendants based their state court
 27 motion also does not permit interlocutory judicial review of the qualifications or conflicts
 28 of an arbitrator but only identifies "**evident partiality**" as one of the grounds under which
 29 an arbitral award can be vacated.

1 merely interpret or apply the governing law incorrectly, but when the award is
 2 “completely irrational” or “exhibits a ‘manifest disregard of the law.’” *Kyocera Corp.*
 3 *v. Prudential-Bache Trade Services, Inc.*, 341 F.3d 987, 997 (9th Cir.2003) (en banc)
 4 (citing *French v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.*, 784 F.2d 902, 906 (9th
 5 Cir.1986) and *Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Cunard Line, Ltd.* 943 F.2d 1056, 1059–60 (9th
 6 Cir.1991)). A district court’s review of an arbitration award under 9 U.S.C. § 10 is
 7 “extremely limited,” *G.C. and K.B. Inv., Inc. v.. Wilson*, 326 F.3d 1096, 1105 (9th
 8 Cir.2003), and, therefore, this is “a high hurdle” to surpass, *Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v.*
 9 *AnimalFeeds Int’l Corp.*, 130 S.Ct. 1758, 1767 (2010). The purpose of this limited review
 10 is to prevent informal arbitration from becoming “merely a prelude to a more cumbersome
 11 and time-consuming judicial review process.” *Kyocera*, 341 F.3d at 998.

12 **Courts, then, may vacate an arbitration award only if (1) the award constitutes**
 13 **“manifest disregard of the law,” or (2) the award is “completely irrational.”** *Comedy*
 14 *Club, Inc. v. Improv W. Assocs.*, 553 F.3d 1277, 1288 (9th Cir.2009) (internal citations
 15 omitted). To show manifest disregard of the law, it is insufficient to merely show that the
 16 arbitrator misinterpreted or misapplied the law. *Lagstein v. Certain Underwriters at*
 17 *Lloyd’s, London*, 607 F.3d 634, 641 (9th Cir.2010). Similarly, an award is not “irrational”
 18 merely because the arbitrator made “erroneous findings of fact.” *Kyocera*, 341 F.3d at 997.
 19 The award must be confirmed as long as the arbitrator “even arguably construed or applied
 20 the contract and acted within the scope of their authority.” *Barnes v. Logan*, 122 F.3d 820,
 21 822 (9th Cir.1997).

22 Here, Defendants contest the AAA Council’s determination reaffirming Brendan
 23 Hare as the Arbitrator. The AAA rules clearly allow the AAA to determine whether an
 24 arbitrator should be disqualified under the grounds set forth in AAA Rule R-17(a)(i)-(iii).
 25 **Thus, this decision was within the scope of the AAA Council’s powers. AAA Rule**
 26 **R-17(b) makes the AAA Council’s decision conclusive and there is no evidence that**
 27 **the decision disregarded the law or was clearly irrational.**

1 The AAA allowed for extensive briefing regarding Arbitrator Hare's alleged non-
 2 disclosure. The AAA Council acted rationally and did not disregard the law or the AAA's
 3 rules regarding disqualification of an arbitrator for non-disclosure. The AAA Council
 4 thoroughly considered the issues presented and made a rational decision based on the law
 5 and the facts of this case. Thus, this Court cannot reverse the AAA Council's decision to
 6 reaffirm Brendan Hare as the Arbitrator.

7 As the Supreme Court unanimously ruled in *Oxford Health*, the parties are strictly
 8 bound to their agreement to arbitrate and their arbitration agreement contractually limits
 9 judicial review:

10 **Because the parties “bargained for the arbitrator's construction of their
 11 agreement,” an arbitral decision “even arguably construing or applying
 12 the contract” must stand, regardless of a court's view of its (de)merits.**
 Eastern Associated Coal Corp. v. Mine Workers, 531 U.S. 57, 62, 121 S.Ct.
 462, 148 L.Ed.2d 354 (2000).

13 133 S.Ct. 2064 at 2068.

14 Under *Oxford Health*, in their arbitration agreement adopting AAA rules, the
 15 parties bargained for the AAA to decide claims of arbitrator nondisclosure and agreed that
 16 AAA's decision would be conclusive. Defendants not only agreed to but drafted the
 17 arbitration agreement and relinquished any right to judicial review of the AAA' Council's
 18 determination of their claim of non-disclosure made within the scope of the contractually-
 19 delegated authority of the AAA Council because the parties agreed to be bound by Rule
 20 17 which makes the AAA's determination conclusive.⁶ As a result, this motion must also
 21

22 ⁶ As the Ninth Circuit has recognized “parties to an arbitration agreement may
 23 eliminate judicial review by contract” *Aerojet*, 478 F.2d at 251. In *Aerojet*, the Ninth
 24 Circuit found that language in the arbitration agreement that the arbitrator's determination
 25 was “binding” and “non-appealable” did not eliminate judicial review of the claim that an
 26 arbitrator acted outside the scope of his contractually delegated authority. *Id.*; see also *In
 27 re Wal-Mart Wage and Hour Employment Practices Litig.*, 2011 WL 887556, *2, n. 1 (D.
 28 Nev. March 14, 2011). Here, however, where the parties agreed that any claim of
 arbitrator bias would be decided by the AAA Council and the AAA Council's decision
 would be conclusive the parties clearly intended to eliminate judicial review of the merits
 of the AAA Council's determination. *Diemaco v. Colt's M'fring Co.*, *supra*, 11 F.Supp.2d

1 be denied as legally infirm.

2

3 **V. THE MOTION IS SUBSTANTIVELY WITHOUT MERIT**

4 Arbitrator Hare was appointed by the AAA according to AAA policies and
 5 procedures after the parties could not agree on the selection of an arbitrator. As such,
 6 neither Plaintiffs nor Defendants could have “stricken” Arbitrator Hare. The AAA
 7 Council has already reviewed the appointment of Arbitrator Hare and “determined that
 8 Arbitrator Hare will be reaffirmed as arbitrator” of the parties’ dispute.

9 The undisputed facts are that there is no evidence of any relationship between
 10 Arbitrator Hare and any party or their counsel, and neither Hare & Associates nor
 11 Bowdoin have any relationship, whatsoever, with any party or their counsel. No one
 12 disputes that Hare & Associates is Arbitrator Hare’s active law practice, and that Bowdoin
 13 is a company that “has been completely dormant”, has “raised no money” and has “no
 14 investments.” As a result, there is no evidence that the Arbitrator has any direct or indirect
 15 relationship with any party or its counsel, or any interest, financial or otherwise, in the
 16 outcome of this arbitration.

17 Simply stated, there is no basis for Defendants’ claim of “evident partiality”
 18 because Arbitrator Hare had no obligation to make any disclosures specifically about
 19 Bowdoin Street Capital, in that the information concerning a dormant business with no
 20 financial relations can not give rise to a reasonable impression of partiality. Moreover, the
 21 prospective practice area of Bowdoin Street Capital is included within the disclosed
 22 practice areas of Hare & Associates of evaluating litigation claims and representing the
 23 interests of plaintiffs in large class action cases.

24 Importantly, Defendants’ contention is not that Plaintiffs or their attorneys have a

25
 26 _____
 27 at 232 (“When parties agree to arbitrate before the AAA and incorporate the Commercial
 28 Arbitration Rules into their agreement, they are bound by those rules and by the AAA’s
 interpretation.”)

1 relationship, financial or otherwise, with Bowdoin Street Capital. Defendants instead
 2 argue that the existence of a dormant company to explore the possibility of raising funds
 3 to provide capital for litigation that did no business shows a bias or partiality in favor of
 4 plaintiffs in general because plaintiffs are usually the parties who seek litigation
 5 financing.⁷ The problems with Defendants' strained argument are that not only was the
 6 Arbitrator's interest in representing the interests of plaintiffs, consumers and mortgagors
 7 in litigation -- along with the Arbitrator's involvement in evaluating and assessing cases --
 8 fully disclosed on February 26, 2010 in his resume without objection from Defendants,
 9 but also that Defendants' argument is without any possible merit. Practicing law for the
 10 benefit of both plaintiffs and defendants does not show partiality. Otherwise a practitioner
 11 who represents both plaintiffs and defendants could never be an arbitrator in any case,
 12 which is simply not the law.

13 As the Ninth Circuit explained in *New Regency Productions, Inc. v. Nippon Herald*
 14 *Films, Inc.*, 501 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir. 2007), nondisclosure can be the basis for
 15 disqualification or vacatur of an arbitral award only "**if the conflict left undisclosed was**
 16 **real ... and 'not trivial'.**" *Id.* at 1110, quoting *ANR Coal Co., Inc. v. Cogentrix of North*
 17 *Carolina, Inc.*, 173 F.3d 493 (4th Cir. 1999).⁸

19 ⁷ Defendants argument is structured on multiple false premises and unsupported
 20 assumptions. For example, there is absolutely no support for Defendants claim that
 21 litigation finance is used primarily by plaintiffs; in fact the seminar materials refer to
 22 financing intellectual property litigation where the party needing financing is equally
 23 likely to be the defendant. There is also absolutely no support for Defendants' claims that
 24 Bowdoin Street Capital ever even considered financing class actions or that class action
 25 litigation attorneys rely upon third-party financing. Defendants' challenge to Arbitrator
 26 Hare is speculative, remote and uncertain and was correctly and conclusively rejected by
 27 the AAA Council.

28 ⁸ *ANR Coal* held that disqualification requires **evidence of partiality that is**
 29 **"direct, definite and capable of demonstration rather than remote, uncertain or**
 30 **speculative."** 173 F.3d 493. The court should consider four factors; "(1) the extent and
 31 character of the personal interest, pecuniary or otherwise, of the arbitrator in the
 32 proceeding; (2) the directness of the relationship between the arbitrator and the party he

1 **Understandably, courts have rejected claims of evident partiality based**
 2 **on long past, attenuated, or insubstantial connections between a party**
 3 **and an arbitrator.** See, e.g., *Positive Software Solutions, Inc. v. New*
Century Mortgage Corp., 476 F.3d 278, 284 (5th Cir.2007) (en banc)
 (collecting cases). As Justice White explained in his concurrence in
Commonwealth Coatings, it would be unrealistic to expect an arbitrator
 to "provide the parties with his complete and unexpurgated business
 biography." *Commonwealth Coatings*, 393 U.S. at 151, 89 S.Ct. 337
 (White, J., concurring).

6 *New Regency Productions, Inc.*, 501 F.3d at 1110.⁹

7 In *Positive Software Solutions, Inc. v. New Century Mortgage Corp.*, 476 F.3d 278,
 8 284 (5th Cir.2007), which the Ninth Circuit followed in *New Regency*, the Court of Appeal
 9 found that "**nondisclosure alone does not require vacatur of an arbitral award for**
 10 **evident partiality. An arbitrator's failure to disclose must involve a significant**
 11 **compromising connection to the parties.**" 476 F.3d at 282-83.

12 Awarding vacatur in situations such as this would seriously jeopardize the
 13 finality of arbitration. Just as happened here, losing parties would have an
 14 incentive to conduct intensive, after-the-fact investigations to discover the
 15 most trivial of relationships, most of which they likely would not have
 16 objected to if disclosure had been made. Expensive satellite litigation over
 17 nondisclosure of an arbitrator's "complete and unexpurgated business
 18 biography" will proliferate. Ironically, the "mere appearance" standard
 19 would make it easier for a losing party to challenge an arbitration award for
 20 nondisclosure than for actual bias....**While it is true that disclosure of**
 21 **prior significant contacts and business dealings between a prospective**
 22 **arbitrator and the parties furthers informed selection, it is not true, as**
 23 **Justice White's opinion perceptively explains, that "the best informed**
 24 **and most capable potential arbitrators" should be automatically**
 25 **disqualified (and their awards nullified) by failure to inform the parties**
 26 **of trivial relationships.** *Commonwealth Coatings*, 393 U.S. at 150, 89 S.Ct.
 27 at 340.

28 is alleged to favor; **(3)** the connection of that relationship to the arbitration; and **(4)** the
 29 proximity in time between the relationship and the arbitration proceeding." *Id.* Here,
 30 Arbitrator Hare has **no** personal interest in this arbitration, pecuniary or otherwise and **no**
 31 relationship with any party.

32 ⁹ "A relationship between an arbitrator and a party creates a real conflict only where
 33 it is 'so intimate—personally, socially, professionally, or financially—as to cast serious
 34 doubt' on the arbitrator's impartiality." *Northwest Direct Teleservices, Inc. v. Zweizig*,
 35 2011 WL 7331297, at *11 (D. Or. Nov. 18, 2011), citing *New Regency Productions, Inc.*,
 36 and quoting *Merit Ins. Co. v. Leatherby Ins. Co.*, 714 F.2d 673, 680 (7th Cir. 1983).

1 *Id.* at 283.

2 In this case, Defendants fail to show **any relationship whatsoever** between
 3 Arbitrator Hare and any of the parties or their counsel.

4 In *Apusento Garden (Guam) Inc. v. Superior Court of Guam*, 94 F.3d 1346 (9th
 5 Cir. 1996), the Ninth Circuit reversed the disqualification of an arbitrator in an arbitration
 6 concerning ownership of an apartment building where the arbitrator failed to disclose that
 7 he and claimant's expert witness were both limited partners in a partnership that owned
 8 an apartment building. The Ninth Circuit held that the arbitrators failure to disclose his
 9 limited partnership investment could not support vacatur because it did not create an
 10 impression of possible bias.

11 **Without this basis for finding an "impression of possible bias,"** the
 12 remaining indicia of possible bias alluded to by the superior court in its
 13 analysis, including **the fact that the subject of the arbitration was an
 apartment complex and that the limited partnership owned an
 apartment complex, also fail to create a reasonable impression of
 possible bias.**

14
 15 *Id.*, 94 F.3d at 1353.

16 In *Scandinavian Reinsurance Co. Ltd. v. Saint Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co.*
 17 668 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2012), the Second Circuit recently held that under the evident
 18 partiality standard for arbitrator disqualification:

19 [W]e think that a court must focus on the question of how strongly that
 20 **relationship** [between the arbitrator and a party] tends to indicate the
 21 possibility of bias in favor of or against one party, and not on how closely
 22 that relationship appears to relate to the facts of the arbitration. In other
 23 words, even if a particular relationship might be thought to be relevant "to
 24 the arbitration at issue," **that relationship will nevertheless not constitute
 a material conflict of interest if it does not itself tend to show that the
 arbitrator might be predisposed in favor of one (or more) of the parties.**
 As we put it in *Applied Industrial*, for a relationship to be material, and
 therefore require disclosure, it must be such that "[a] reasonable person
 would have to conclude that an arbitrator who failed to disclose [it] ... was
 partial to one side."

25
 26 *Id.* at 75-76, quoting *Applied Indus. Materials Corp. v. Ovalar Makine Ticaret Ve Sanayi*,
 27 A.S., 492 F.3d 132, 137 (2d Cir. 2007). Defendants fail to show that the facts upon which
 28 they seek disqualification could support a reasonable belief that Arbitrator Hare would

1 be partial to either side in this arbitration.

2 In *Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, Stanford Hospital Clinics v. U.S. Nursing*
 3 *Corp.*, 2002 WL 1162390 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2002), Judge Maxine Chesney explained
 4 that “Vacatur of an arbitration award for ‘evident partiality’ is appropriate where ‘the
 5 possibility of bias [is] direct, definite and capable of demonstration rather than remote,
 6 uncertain and speculative.’” *Id.* at *6, quoting *Middlesex Mutual Ins. Co. v. Levine*, 675
 7 F.2d 1197, 1202 (4th Cir.1982).¹⁰ The court held that an arbitrator could not be
 8 disqualified based on failure to disclose her involvement with several non-profit groups
 9 benefitting children, holding that “Any possibility of bias capable of being inferred from
 10 these activities is simply too ‘remote, uncertain and speculative’ to warrant vacatur.” *Id.*

11 In *Nordahl Development Corp., Inc. v. Salomon Smith Barney*, 309 F.Supp.2d 1257
 12 (D. Or. 2004) the court held that

13 **Plaintiff does not allege that an arbitrator failed to disclose any relevant**
 14 **relationship with either defendant before the arbitration began. Nor**
 15 **does he assert that an arbitrator failed to disclose any conflict of**
 16 **interest such as having a stake in the arbitration's outcome.** Instead
 17 plaintiff's allegations essentially attack the integrity of the arbitration
 decision itself. Therefore the stricter standard governing actual bias cases
 applies to plaintiff's claim of partiality. Plaintiff has failed to allege
 sufficient facts to support a claim under that standard.

18 *Id.* at 1266-67. (internal citation omitted)

19 In *Merit Insurance Company v. Leatherby Insurance Company, supra*, 714 F.2d
 20 673 (7th Cir 1983), the Seventh Circuit reversed a district court order vacating an
 21 arbitration award based on failure to disclose. Judge Posner stated:

22 [N]o one supposes that either the Commercial Arbitration Rules or the Code
 23 of Ethics for Arbitrators requires disclosure of every former social or
 24 financial relationship with a party or a party's principals. . . . The test . . . is
 25 whether, having due regard for the different expectations regarding
 26 impartiality that parties bring to arbitration than to litigation, **the**
 27 **relationship between [the arbitrator and the party's president] was so**
 28 **intimate-personally, socially, professionally, or financially-as to cast**
 29 **serious doubt on [the arbitrator's] impartiality.**

10 As Judge Chesney observed, *Middlesex Mutual* was cited with approval by the
 Ninth Circuit in *Schmitz v. Zilveti*, 20 F.3d 1043, 1046 (9th Cir. 1994).

1 *Id.* at 678-80.

2 Here, Defendants do not contend that there is any relationship between the
 3 Arbitrator and the parties, financial or otherwise. Rather, what Defendant argues is that
 4 the Arbitrator's experience in a specific area of law somehow renders him partial, even
 5 where there is no relationship to the parties and claims in dispute. This is simply not the
 6 test for evident partiality. The erroneous standard urged by Defendants would result in
 7 the wholesale disqualification of competent arbitrators. In this case, Defendants explicitly
 8 requested arbitrators with transactional experience, and yet the fact that Arbitrator Hare
 9 possesses transactional experience which includes real estate is now inexplicably the basis
 10 of Defendants' belated challenge.

11 Indeed, a reasonable impression of partiality cannot not be created by the fact that
 12 Arbitrator Hare has represented the interests of plaintiffs and consumers, in addition to his
 13 representation of corporate defendants. Defendants' allegations set forth nothing more
 14 than a repetition of information already disclosed in the Hare Resume. The fact that
 15 Arbitrator Hare has "over 30 years' experience litigating the full spectrum of commercial
 16 and corporate legal issues" (Hare Resume, Exhibit 2), is not "likely to give rise to
 17 justifiable doubt as to the arbitrator's impartiality." Far from creating an impression of
 18 partiality, as explained by the Court of Appeals in *ANR Coal Co. v. Cogentrix of N.C., Inc.*, 173 F.3d 493, 500 (4th Cir. 1999), the best and most impartial arbitrators would be
 20 those with broad knowledge of the legal issues with a view from both sides of the aisle.

21 **Not only does precedent thus compel our rejection of ANR's contention, but sound policy also counsels this result.** Parties value commercial
 22 arbitration, at least in part, because they "prefer a tribunal knowledgeable
 23 about the subject matter of their dispute to a generalist court with its austere
 24 impartiality but limited knowledge of subject matter." *Merit*, 714 F.2d at
 25 679; see also *Moreelite Constr. Corp. v. New York City Dist. Council
 Carpenters Benefit Funds*, 748 F.2d 79, 83 (2d Cir. 1984) ("parties agree
 to arbitrate precisely because they prefer a tribunal with expertise
 regarding the particular subject matter of their dispute").

26 *Id.* at 500.

27 The ANR court explained that trivial facts need not be disclosed.

28

1 **The approach proposed by ANR would permit a "disgruntled party" to seize upon an undisclosed relationship "as a pretext for invalidating the award."** *In re Andros Compania Maritima, S.A.*, 579 F.2d 691, 700 (2d Cir. 1978). Under such a rule, an arbitration award could be vacated due to an arbitrator's failure to disclose a trivial fact even though that fact, if known prior to the arbitration, would not have enabled the losing party to have the arbitrator removed for cause. Such a system would undermine the parties faith in commercial arbitration and make the task of finding qualified arbitrators "exceedingly burdensome." *Peoples Security Life Ins. Co. v. Monumental Life Ins. Co.*, 991 F.2d 141, 146 (4th Cir. 1993).

6 *Id.*

7 The AAA's Cannon II, although complied with in this case, was likewise rejected
8 as a basis for disqualification:

9 Respondent's rely on Canon II of the AAA Code of Ethics for Arbitrators
10 in Commercial Disputes. Canon II states that "arbitrators should disclose the
11 existence of interests or relationships that are likely to affect their
12 impartiality or that might reasonably create an appearance that they are
13 biased against one party" and should "make a reasonable effort to inform
14 themselves of any interests or relationships described in the preceding
15 paragraph." Even if Brewer violated Cannon II (and it is not at all clear that
he did), the Code of Ethics itself forecloses any use of such a violation as
a basis for vacatur. **The Preamble of the Code specifically states that "it**
does not form part of the arbitration rules of the [AAA]" and "does not
establish new or additional grounds for judicial review of arbitration
awards."

16 *Id.* at 497.

17 Finally, the Court noted that the type of issues argued by Defendants here, even if
18 they should have been disclosed, nevertheless do not give rise to disqualification:

19 **"Failure to disclose the sort of attenuated, nonsubstantial relationships**
20 **at issue here violates neither the teaching of Commonwealth Coatings**
21 **nor AAA Rule 19.** As Judge Posner (citing Justice White's concurrence)
22 observed in a similar situation, to hold that Rule 19 "requires disclosure of
every former social or financial relationship with a party or a party's
23 principals" would make it "impractical for persons in the business world to
be arbitrators, thereby depriving the parties of the services of those who
24 might be best informed and qualified to decide particular types of cases."
Merit Ins. Co. v. Leatherby Ins. Co., 714 F.2d 673, 677 (7th Cir. 1983)."

25 *Id.* at 499.

26 In federal court, evident partiality claims are governed by federal law not state law.
Fidelity Federal Bank, FSB v. Durga Ma Corp., 386 F.3d 1306, 1313 (9th Cir. 2004).
27 **(We look to the FAA and federal law to determine whether Arbitrator Leib was**

1 **evidently partial**, whether vacation of the arbitration award was required and whether
 2 Fidelity's evident partiality challenge is waived.") As the Ninth Circuit explained, federal
 3 law governs evident partiality even where the arbitration agreement calls for state law to
 4 be applied because issues about arbitrator bias relate to the process of arbitration rather
 5 than the substance of the underlying dispute. *Id.*

6 Nevertheless, Defendants virtually ignore federal law and instead rely heavily on
 7 a state law decision by a California court *Benjamin, Weill & Mazer v. Kors*, 195
 8 Cal.App.4th 40 (2011). *Benjamin* addressed an action to collect legal fees arbitrated as
 9 part of the local bar association's Mandatory Fee Arbitration Program where the arbitrator
 10 at the time of the arbitration, was primarily engaged in the defense of attorneys and law
 11 firms in cases involving professional responsibility and was actively representing a law
 12 firm in a case before the California Supreme Court involving a legal dispute over legal
 13 fees. *Id.* at 72. The *Benjamin* court found that these facts should have been disclosed
 14 because a reasonable person would doubt whether the arbitrator's "dependence on
 15 business from lawyers and law firms sued by former clients would prevent him from
 16 taking the side of a client in a fee dispute with a former law firm, because doing so might
 17 "put at risk" his ability to secure business from the lawyers and law firms whose business
 18 he solicits." *Id.* at 71.

19 Defendants try to liken this case to *Benjamin* by arguing that "evident partiality"
 20 exists because Bowdoin Street Capital's stillborn and dormant efforts to raise money to
 21 fund plaintiffs' litigation would lead a reasonable person to doubt Arbitrator Hare's his
 22 independence and impartiality because for his litigation funding business to succeed, Mr.
 23 Hare would need to have a good reputation among plaintiffs' counsel. Defendants'
 24 disqualification argument thus depends on their imaginary premise that Arbitrator Hare
 25 is dependent on business from plaintiffs' law firms to such an extent that his partiality
 26 should be in doubt. Arbitrator Hare's supplemental disclosure that Bowdoin Street Capital
 27 has never financed any litigation or even raised any investment capital, however, belies
 28

1 Defendant's Alice-in-Wonderland accusation that he depends on business from plaintiffs'
 2 law firms that hire him to find financing, as he has never had any revenue from Bowdoin
 3 Street Capital.

4 As the California state court stated in *Benjamin*, “**ordinary and insubstantial**
 5 **business dealings**” arising from participation in the business or legal community” need
 6 **not** be disclosed and that **disclosure is required only of “relationships [that] are**
 7 **substantial and involve financial considerations creating an impression of possible**
 8 **bias.”** *Id.* at 72. Bowdoin Street Capital, which has never done any business at all and
 9 never received or generated any revenue, does not evidence any dependence on business
 10 from plaintiffs' law firms or any other financial consideration that could create any
 11 reasonable impression of bias. See *Nemecek & Cole v. Horn*, 208 Cal.App.4th 641, 649-50
 12 (2012) (distinguishing *Benjamin*). Like the arbitrator in *Nemecek & Cole*, Arbitrator Hare
 13 represents the interests of both defendants and plaintiffs and therefore “[t]his matter is
 14 nothing like the *Benjamin* case.” 208 Cal.App.4th at 649. Moreover, Arbitrator Hare’s
 15 representation of plaintiffs’ as well as defendants’ interests in class action litigation was
 16 fully disclosed.¹¹

17 Defendants also cite *Thomas v. City of North Las Vegas*, 122 Nev. 82 (2006) to
 18

19 ¹¹ The California appellate court decision in *Mt. Holyoke Homes L.P. v. Jeffer*

20 *Mangels Butler & Mitchell*, 2013 WL 5321158 (Cal. App. Sep. 24, 2013) also does not
 21 help Defendants. In that case, the arbitrator who was selected by the parties in a legal
 22 malpractice case failed to disclose that he had used one of the partners in defendant law
 23 firm as a reference on his resume. The Court vacated the final award finding that “An
 24 objective observer could reasonably conclude that an arbitrator listing a prominent litigator
 25 as a reference on his resume would be reluctant to rule against the law firm in which that
 26 attorney is a partner in a malpractice case.” *Id.* at *8. *Mt. Holyoke Homes* exemplifies the
 27 nondisclosure of a relationship between the arbitrator and a party that must be disclosed
 28 because it creates the reasonable appearance of partiality. By contrast, the alleged
 nondisclosure here could not possibly support disqualification because an “arbitrator
 cannot reasonably be expected to disclose all events in the arbitrator’s past, including
 those not connected with the parties, the facts and the issues in controversy, that
 conceivably might cause a party to prefer another arbitrator. *Id.* at *7, quoting *Haworth*
v. Superior Court, 50 Cal.4th 372, 395 (2010).

1 argue that nondisclosure itself requires disqualification regardless of whether there is any
2 evident partiality or bias. The *Thomas* court, however, found that an arbitrator's failure
3 to disclose a conflict may establish bias only if there is an actual conflict to disclose, and
4 the undisclosed relationship gives rise to a "reasonable impression of partiality." *Id.* at 99.
5 Defendant simply cannot meet that test. Moreover, Defendant neglects to mention that in
6 *Thomas*, the Nevada Supreme **reversed** the trial court's vacatur of an arbitration decision
7 and held that an arbitrator's membership on a rotating panel of arbitrators for city and
8 police unions did not give rise to a reasonable impression of partiality in arbitration of
9 dispute over termination of police officers, and, the arbitrator therefore owed no duty to
10 disclose his membership. *Id.* at 102.¹²

11 None of the cases cited by Defendants hold to the contrary. Defendants have failed
12 to cite a single case where the failure to disclose information which does not give rise to
13 a reasonable impression of partiality, would nevertheless provide a basis for
14 disqualification. Therefore, the information that has now been disclosed and ruled on by
15 the AAA Council concerning Bowdoin Street Capital does not indicate any partiality or
16 lack of independence or support disqualification under Rule R-17.

17 Because there are no facts showing any “evident partiality”, Defendants’ motion
18 to disqualify Arbitrator Hare is also substantively meritless and would have to be denied
19 even if this Court had jurisdiction to hear this motion, and the legal authority to decide this
20 issue.

23 ¹² In *Fong v. MGM Mirage International Marketing, Inc.*, the Nevada Supreme
24 Court held in an unpublished decision that "The appearance of impropriety, standing
25 alone, is insufficient to establish evident partiality in an actual bias case...because a
26 reasonable impression of partiality does not necessarily mean that the arbitration award
27 was the product of impropriety." *Id.* at 7. See Exhibit 4 to Blum Dec. This case, like
28 *Fong*, is not a nondisclosure case because full disclosure has been made before any final
award has issued and, since Arbitrator Hare was appointed by the AAA and not selected
by the parties, the AAA Council would have upheld Arbitrator Hare's appointment
because he has no bias, even if Defendants had challenged his appointment earlier in the
arbitration.

1
2 **VI. CONCLUSION**

3 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully submit that Defendants' motion
4 to disqualify Arbitrator Hare must be denied.

5
6 Respectfully submitted,

7 Dated: September 27, 2013

8
9 **BLUMENTHAL, NORDREHAUG &**
BHOWMIK

10
11 By: /s/ Norman B. Blumenthal
12 Norman B. Blumenthal

13
14 2255 Calle Clara
15 La Jolla, California 92037
16 Telephone: (858) 551-1223
17 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232

18
19 Gerard & Associates
20 2840 South Jones Blvd.
21 Building D, Unit 4
22 Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
23 Telephone: (702) 251-0093
24 Facsimile: (702) 251-0094

25
26 Burt Wiand
27 Florida State Bar #407690
28 Wiand Guerra King
3000 Bay Port Drive, Suite 600
Tampa, FL 33607
Telephone: (813) 347-5100
Facsimile: (813) 347-5199

29
30 ***Attorneys For The Plaintiffs***